

Durham Research Online

Deposited in DRO:

12 March 2015

Version of attached file:

Accepted Version

Peer-review status of attached file:

Peer-reviewed

Citation for published item:

Miles-Watson, Jonathan (2015) 'Ruptured landscapes, sacred spaces and the stretching of landscape capital.', in Ruptured landscapes : landscape and identity in times of social change. Dordrecht: Springer , pp. 149-165. Landscape series. (19).

Further information on publisher's website:

http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-9903-4_10

Publisher's copyright statement:

Additional information:

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in DRO
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full DRO policy](#) for further details.

10. Miles-Watson: Ruptured Landscapes, Sacred Spaces and the Stretching of Landscape Capital

Jonathan Miles-Watson (Durham University)

This chapter explores the ruptured landscapes of postcolonial Hill Stations in North India. These Hill Stations experienced massive population movements after independence, when the colonial administrators they were constructed for left and new people moved into the cities. Drawing on ethnographic research with minority Christian communities in contemporary Shimla, I demonstrate how the landscapes generated through the worship of these communities heals the ruptures of history by reweaving the trace of historical action. These ruptured communities are therefore rich generators of landscape capital, but of a radically different kind to that discussed in the extant literature. This calls for a reformulation of the landscape capital concept, from a fixed and limited description of historical processes to a widely applicable concept that does justice to the way that past and present are woven together in living landscapes of worship. Postcolonial Shimla, once Simla, the summer capital of colonial India, presents a wonderful case study for these more general issues. Its landscapes provoke questions about the role of memory and identity in the postcolonial city. The Christian landscapes are in many ways the crux of these discomfiting questions, but they also offer answers. Moreover, these answers are not hoarded by a minority group, but rather are implicitly presented, as a sort of cipher, to the wider civil society. Through this process, the churchscapes of Shimla are able to heal wider landscape ruptures and stand as a model for harmonious heritage practice in the contemporary city.

Keywords: Churchscapes, landscape capital, Shimla, Lévi-Strauss, spatial capital, religious capital.

Over the past thirty years a considerable amount of literature has developed around the concepts of social capital and cultural capital (Bourdieu 1986; Coleman 1988; Putnam 2000 et al.). While these concepts have their problems (Morrow 2008) they have proved to be useful tools for a wide range of people, including academics, policy makers and faith based institutions. Social capital has thus become a common term across a range of discourses, providing a common language for diverse actors. It is therefore somewhat surprising that, despite the recent spatial turn (Arias and Warf 2008), there has been little development of the related concepts of spatial capital (Marcus 2010) and landscape capital (Brookfield 1984). On the rare occasions that these concepts have been discussed they are used in a limited way and this is reflected in subsequent policy formation. What is more, the discussion of landscape capital, which I privilege over spatial capital, has historically been the least dynamic of the related pair and its use has been restricted to the discussion of small scale, rural societies, where social change is commonly perceived as occurring gradually. It may therefore seem

strange to apply this term to an urban society that has suffered from great social upheavals, yet, as this chapter unfolds, we will come to see that such an application is both logical and insightful.

The need for this, somewhat novel, application of the concept of landscape capital arose in the field. While working with Christians in Shimla (North India) I came to understand that these communities were rich in something that I could describe as landscape capital; however, this landscape capital was of a radically different nature to that discussed in the extant literature. The often discussed issues of aesthetics, access and diversity, danced around the church landscapes, but were not as central to landscape capital as issues of identity, postcoloniality and rupture. This experience called for a reformulation of the concept of landscape capital, which stretched the concept by moving it from being a rather fixed (and limited) description of historical processes, to a widely applicable concept, which captures something of the way that the past and the present can become woven together through landscapes of worship. Moreover, these landscapes perform a far greater civil service than simply providing a cheap venue for events, for they have the capacity to heal the ruptures of history by incorporating the trace of historical action.

10.1 Landscape, Culture and Capital

The related concepts of cultural capital and social capital have become familiar ways to describe the value that various nongovernmental groups bring to both their members and wider civil society (Baker and Miles-Watson 2010). Following Field (2003) it is possible to locate three main schools of writings about social/cultural capital, which are formed around three foundational figures: Robert Putnam (2000), Pierre Bourdieu (1986) and James Coleman (1988). These three thinkers have considerable differences in their conceptions with, broadly speaking, Bourdieu emphasising the way that cultural capital benefits the individual and Coleman and Putnam focussing more on the way that it benefits the group (Baker and Miles Watson 2010). There is however a further important distinction between Coleman and Putnam's theories: for Coleman the social capital generated by a group, such as the family unit, benefits that particular group, whereas Putnam expands the benefits of social capital to suggest that it can be generated by a group for the benefit of wider civil society (Putnam 2000: 25). It is particularly this last idea that has captured the imagination of policy makers and made social capital theory a way for non-governmental groups to justify government support.

Despite their differences all these accounts are unified in presenting an overwhelmingly homocentric account of social/cultural capital. It has largely ignored the non-human elements that constitute any given group and focused on humans as though their societies and cultural worlds were entirely separate from anything non-human. From such a perspective, humans exist within a network of other humans that acts both on and within (but never with) the wider environment. It is perhaps then not as surprising as first imagined that there is comparatively little attention paid to the concepts of spatial capital and landscape capital. Indeed, what discussions there are of landscape capital in academic literature have taken place largely independent of the discussions of

social/cultural capital. Most contemporary uses of the term “landscape capital” trace it back to Harold Brookfield, who used the term to capture the value that can be stored in the land by agricultural labourers in small scale societies (Brookfield 1984, 1986, 2001a, 2001b; Brookfield and Blaikie 1987).

This understanding of landscape capital can be seen as a development of Coleman's social capital theory in that, alike to Coleman, Brookfield imagines the capital as being generated by a group and stored to be used by later descendants, only here the capital is expressly stored in the land (Brookfield and Blaikie 1987). If I believed that the concept of landscape capital had to remain this limited then I would find it of little use as a way of describing and mapping the kinds of diverse processes that concern this volume. However, the term landscape is here being used only in one very specific way. If the term landscape is broadened, as I believe it must be, then the concept of landscape capital is correspondingly broadened and it is here that it becomes useful for understanding the way that communities are able to overcome historical ruptures.

10.2 Landscape Processes

The term landscape has a long and contested history, which it is redundant to reproduce here. It is however useful to note that the term has a history of referring to actions rather than objects (Olwig 1996). In its contemporary use, by geographers, such as Wylie (2007), and anthropologists, such as Ingold (2000, 2011), there is a common trend of understanding landscape as (following the artist David Reason) a “polyrhythmic composition of processes” (Ingold 2000: 201). From this perspective landscape is not something that is perceived, nor is it the backdrop that human action unfolds upon, rather it is a mutual constitution of person and place through action (Ingold 2000: 198-201). As people flow and knot around certain places, landscapes are formed that bind together the human and the non-human, the animate and the inanimate, the past, the present and the future. This temporal blurring is facilitated by a dual process of narrativisation (Basso 1996) and actions that leave a trace that others will to some extent have to reckon with in the future (Ingold 2007). From this perspective landscapes are never complete, rather they are in a constant state of becoming (Ingold 2000).

If landscape is a polyrhythmic composition of processes then it stands to reason that the concept of landscape capital has to refer to something far more complicated than simply a value that can be stored in the land. What is more, from our new perspective there is clearly no need to restrict the notion of landscape capital to small scale, rural societies. For we are all surely, in one way or another, capable of both generating and accessing landscape capital. I therefore here employ the term “landscape capital” to refer to the social and personal development that arises from the continuing historical interrelation of human and non-human, in any given (somewhat artificially) bounded place. From this perspective landscape capital is something that is both historically developed and continuously renewed, it is not something that is held in the land alone; rather it is

generated at the interface between the mind and the world. Being constantly engaged in a historically determined process of renewal, it can never be something that, as Brookfield suggested, is simply developed by one generation to be exploited by the next. What is more, as it is not something that is constructed or found and then used, or underused, it cannot be developed by simply diversifying the action that occurs in any given place. Indeed, as I shall demonstrate, such diversification of action may actually lessen the landscape's capital.

10.3 Space and Landscape Capital

When, six years ago, I first presented these ideas at an international symposium in Estonia (Miles-Watson 2008), the geographer Edward Soja remarked that the paper would read better if I replaced the term *landscape* with the term *space*. I have however in this instance deliberately chosen to avoid the perhaps more fashionable term *space* and the corresponding concept of *spatial capital*. This is because I believe that the notion of *landscape* captures better the processes that I am trying to describe than the term *space*. Both historical and contemporary uses of the term *landscape* make it a natural choice to describe the phenomena that I am concerned with, *viz*, the way that human and non-human actors engage in the mutual constitution of something tangible (Olwig 1996). In contrast, the term *space* suggests to many a rather vague area that something is done within (Ingold 2011: 145). It therefore has a separation between action, time and area that *landscape* etymologically folds together more neatly. Of course the term *space* can be used in a sophisticated and multifaceted way (Lefebvre 1991; Soja 1996); however such usage typically results in a complication of the discourse that simply using the term *landscape* avoids.

If we turn to examine the currently emerging academic definition of *spatial capital* then it is clear to see that the dividing of actor, action, time and space continues. The emerging field of *spatial capital* scholarship has to date been led by the Swedish architect Lars Marcus (2007, 2010). His approach to *spatial capital* is neatly summarised in a recent discussion where he defined *spatial capital* as the measurable effects of urban design on urban living (Marcus 2007). The space of the city is seen in this equation as designed *apriori* and only once completed is it inhabited by people, whose ability to act within the space is helped or hindered by its historic design (*ibid.*). It is clear then that to describe the dynamic processes that are the topic of this book, the term *space* and the associated discussion of *spatial capital* is inadequate. To distinguish my position from these approaches I have therefore deliberately chosen to term the theory that I here develop *landscape capital*, for it is this term that seems best suited to capturing the valance of the complicated set of processes that are here under discussion.

10.4 Religious Capital Theory

The language of capitals has been increasingly adopted by religious groups to explain the unique ways that they contribute to civil society (Baker and Miles-Watson 2010). When the language of capitals is used by academics, NGOs and religious organisations to describe their work it nearly

always draws from Putnam's definitions of social capital and very rarely uses Bourdieu's definition (ibid.). This is partly because of the greater accessibility of Putnam's work and partly because his essentially positive message about the way that communities can work together to better society, is a preferred descriptor of their work to Bourdieu's slightly cynical description of the personal rewards of religious action (ibid.). Indeed, this is a trend that I will be largely following later in this paper as I try to express, in transferable terms, the phenomena that I experienced in both Northumberland and North India.

A well-documented problem with Putnam's early approach to social capital is that its overly positive spin both fails to adequately capture the destructive and divisive aspects of social networks (Putzel 1997; Martin and Benassi 1999). In response to these criticisms, Putnam has complicated his understanding of social capital, particularly by distinguishing between intra-group bonding capital and intergroup bridging capital (Putnam 2000: 25). This division has been further complicated by Woolcock who introduced the concept of linking capital as a form of social uplift. Here again I find the idea of landscape of use, for, as I have argued elsewhere (Miles-Watson and Miles-Watson 2011) landscape is never a single process, but rather a weave of often conflicting processes that nevertheless are somehow held together through a shared act of dwelling.

I have previously developed extensive arguments about both power struggles within the particular landscapes that I will discuss later in this paper (Miles-Watson 2013) and the variety of ways that people have available to operate within such contexts (Miles-Watson 2012). I intend therefore to restrict my discussion here to the bridging aspects of landscape capital within two distinct geographical regions. In doing this I follow a wider trend in religious capital theory, which has seen academics, policy makers and practitioners have develop, often seemingly independently of each other, the idea that religious groups are not only excellent generators of social capital (Putnam 2000: 67), but that they also make a distinct contribution to civil society, which has been termed religious capital or spiritual capital (Baker and Miles-Watson 2010).

Baker and Skinner (2006) have influentially combined the descriptors *spiritual capital* and *religious capital* to suggest that they are not simply mutually interchangeable descriptors, but actually terms to describe different aspects of one overarching process. They suggest that spiritual capital should be used to define the (often personal) process of energising, which allows for the completion of social good, that occurs through religious engagement, whereas religious capital represents the communally held tangible social outworking of spiritual capital (Baker and Skinner 2006: 9). The interplay of human and non-human, group and individual, that this model suggests certainly fits well with the dynamic processes that are under discussion here and the understanding of landscape that we have now developed. It therefore lends itself well to the modeling of sacred landscape capital where all these elements are clearly at play.

10.5 Landscapes of the Sacred and Capital Theory

The exploration of aspects of sacred landscapes is an established part of the academic study of religion (Eliade 1959; Smith 1978; Lane 1988 et al.). Much of this literature has dealt with specific localities and religious performances under the heading of sacred place (Davies 1994). However, over the second half of the last decade this movement gathered a new focus largely due to the general academic spatial turn (Arias and Warf 2008) and the particular spatial turn that occurred within the study of religion, which was lead by Knott (2005a, 2005b, 2008, 2010). This work has not surprisingly tended to prefer to use the term space, which is viewed as both a more dynamic term and a way of marking out a distinct approach to older studies of sacred landscapes and sacred places. Landscape, as defined above, is however the perfect term to bridge the locality / space binary and bring the rich variety of discourse about various religious practices into dialogue. The discipline of religious studies then is, I believe, at a point where the introduction of a complex concept of sacred landscapes is called for.

Despite the recent boom in both religious capital and sacred space literature these discussions have been largely silent on sacred landscape capital. Where the physical location of a religious group has been explored, religious capital research has tended to focus on the concept of sacred space and in particular religious buildings (Cameron 2004; Gray 2004; Dynes 2006 et al.). The buildings in such research are presented as a backdrop, or stage upon which the action of religious worship and religiously inspired social action unfold, and the debate has largely been around the extent to which the space is optimal for religiously inspired social action and how it can be further optimised (Baker and Smith 2010: 22-24). This is a long way from both the experiences of entering into religious landscapes that I will discuss later in this chapter and the understanding of landscape capital developed above. Yet, it is not unreasonable to suggest that religious landscapes may generate something that is both unique and of value to wider civil society. Indeed, the type of landscape capital that I, in Shimla, joined in the generation of is something that is tied to patterns of worship; therefore it is presumably far more likely to be a feature of religious groups than their secular counterparts.

10.6 Capital and Churchscapes: A Northumbrian Example

While religious capital literature has attempted to embrace a range of religious denominations it has fundamentally operated from a Christian base (Miles-Watson and Baker 2010). This has led to it having an innate bias towards a Christian-centric understanding of the way that religion and society function, which poses obvious problems for the construction of a universal model. Rather than try here to directly counter this problem I instead intend to complicate the existing discussion by pointing out an important aspect of the landscape of Christian churches, albeit at the same time as arguing both that people who belong to other faiths can form a central element of Christian landscapes and Christian landscapes can form an integral part of wider sacred and secular

landscapes. What is more, I am certain that the kind of landscape capital I am here discussing is both far from universal and present in some non-Christian religious landscapes.

The connections, between church landscapes, religious capital and wider landscape theory first began to form in my mind 2007 while working with the Glendale group of churches in North East England. This is a group of ten historic, Anglican, churches, located in a sparsely populated region. The church buildings had a long-standing presence in the landscape and yet their value was seen to be undermined by falling numbers of regular congregants. Despite the problems that these churches faced, it was immediately clear to me that they were seen as of central importance to the local villagers, many of whom did not attend formal church worship regularly (Miles-Watson et al. 2008). The reason for this value was not the ability of the buildings to double as post offices (as is often assumed), nor simply a form of vicarious religion (Davie 2006), but rather the way that the trace of past worship could be observed in the contemporary landscape of the churches; in particular, the way that interpretative stories had become woven around the buildings (Miles-Watson et al. 2008: 14). This combination of entering into the church landscape, perceiving the action of others in the landscape and what I have previously termed "implicit mythology" (Miles-Watson 2012) had a powerful ability to create connections across time; furthermore this connectivity bolstered collective identity and helped to anchor people amidst the flows of social change.

For ease of reference I have termed this kind of sacred, bonding, landscape capital *churchscape capital*. In doing this I employ the term simply for convenience as shorthand for church landscape capital. I would like to distance this sense of churchscape capital from previous uses of the term (Greenagle 2001; Leppman 2005), which have tended to use it in a more limited sense to describe the largely architectural presence of churches within particular landscapes. In many ways my understanding of churchscape capital mirrors Tim Ingold's famous discussion of the way that a typical rural church landscape functions. In his highly influential essays on perceptions of the environment, Ingold discusses a landscape painting of a rural churchscape which he suggests possesses elements of a Bakhtinian chronotope (2000: 205-207). He argues that the church both resonates with and helps to reinforce simultaneously the human conception of linear time and cyclical time. It is not a landscape that is ever complete, but rather it is in a constant state of becoming through interaction with human and non-human elements. What is more, because the church bears the trace of action over lifetimes it creates an intergenerational link with the ancestors of the village, who are buried in the surrounding church yard and therefore both metaphorically and literally rooted in the church landscape.

The resonances with Ingold's idealised churchscape and the lived reality that I encountered in Northumberland are obvious. Indeed, I would like to offer Ingold's theory as way of broadening this ethnographic evidence and the ethnographic evidence as way of answering those of Ingold's critics that have suggested that in choosing to discuss a church landscape painting he gives himself

the liberty of not having to deal with the messy reality of an ethnographic exploration of church congregations. That said, we will now leave this cosy and somewhat simplistic understanding of churchscape capital, in order to explore the value generated by Christian landscapes of worship in the context of social turmoil and landscape rupture. For, it is by engaging Ingold's model with information derived from recent fieldwork with Christian communities in North India that I will arrive at a powerful understanding of the way that churchscape capital heals landscape ruptures.

10.7 Shimla as a Ruptured Landscape

In the understanding of churchscape capital developed above a sense of continuity is central to the model, however in 2006 I adopted Shimla as a field site, a place where the sense of continuity has been dramatically ruptured by the traumas of historical change. Shimla today is the capital of the small Himalayan state of Himachal Pradesh; however it was formerly known as Simla, during which time it operated as the summer capital of British India. It is therefore a city with a strong colonial connection, more so than many other contemporary metros in India. This sense of connection with a time now passed is furthered by the fact that the city was built on a largely green-field site, meaning that little in the city predates the colonial period (Pubby 1988: 20). Furthermore, there was an attempt to here build a landscape that would evoke memories of Europe, for either Europeans or those of European ancestry (Bhasin 2009: 87-89). This has resulted in a landscape that is in part an invocation of the other: an attempt to mimic a landscape shaped by generations of action that had occurred across the other side of the world (Miles-Watson 2012). During the colonial period this sense of displacement was added to by the many people of European ancestry or birth who left their trace on the landscape, albeit not as exclusively as some of them would have desired (ibid.).

In the period after independence the city, now named Shimla, witnessed a massive population movement when most of its previous European residents departed; however, the overall population of the city, far from declining, increased (Chandramouli 2011: 47). Today Shimla is a migrant city with residents drawn from all areas of India (ibid.). During the summer the pedestrianised streets are so crowded with tourists (mostly Indian, but some European and American) that walking along the Mall during the middle of the day becomes an art of weaving through crowds. Not surprisingly, the landscape of Shimla tends to excite strong opinions of one sort or another and during my time in Shimla I catalogued polarised responses (Miles-Watson 2013). This ambivalence reflects what I am terming, drawing on landscape rupture theory (Gable 2010: 125), the city's ruptured past: the sense that a massive population movement has occurred, which has caused a rupture in the weave of the landscape.

10.8 Shimla's Churchscape

When in 2006 I first entered into the weave of Shimla's landscape it was winter and a light dusting of snow covered the mock Tudor buildings and surrounding deodars. On the horizon the

snowcapped peaks of the high Himalayas gleamed while the snow underfoot muffled the sounds of the then quiet pedestrianised Mall Road. Rather than finding myself part of one of the travel horror stories of a concrete jungle, I felt that Ursula Sharma had it right when she suggested that Shimla was a very pleasant place to do fieldwork (Sharma 1986, vi). Over the years, my understanding of Shimla transformed and deepened as I learnt more about the seasonality of the Mall and how to navigate the problems surrounding water supply and refuse disposal that accompanied life in this city. But throughout the changing seasons one thing that remained constant was the sense that Christ Church Cathedral (Figure 10.1) was central to the landscapes of Shimla. Although the snow that swirled around it in the winter changed to flows of tourists in the summer, the central reality of Christ Church being at the heart of things always remained.

The cathedral was originally designed by Colonel Boileau in 1844 to imitate the Gothic cathedrals of Northern Europe (Buck 1925). During the colonial period it formed the centre of Anglican worship in the city and had several notable congregants, including Rudyard Kipling and successive Viceroys (Miles-Watson 2013). In the post-independence period the nature of its congregation substantially changed and Christ Church became part of a coalition of protestant churches known as the Church of North India. A recent survey put the congregation of Christ Church Cathedral at around 150, with 85% drawn from the middle class, 10% from the upper class (mostly landholders who live out of town) and 5% from the lower classes (Chung 2000). Although the number of regular congregants at the Church has dropped, mirroring the significant drop in the percentage of self-confessing Christians in Shimla, it is important to note that Christ Church Cathedral remains to this day a place of active worship, as well as functioning as both a pilgrimage destination and tourist attraction.

Figure 10.1—Christ Church Cathedral, Shimla (Photo by Jonathan Miles-Watson)

Although most know Christ Church only from the outside, many do venture in where they can and find something quite different. Although I found the church to be delightfully peaceful in winter, it gained a new dimension in summer when tourists would wrestle with security guards to take footage of the celebrations (Miles-Watson 2013). The first service I ever went to at Christ Church I was immediately affected by it and that may have had something to do with elements that reminded of me of England, the country of my birth. I was intrigued by the mix of the familiar and the strange that I encountered within the church. In particular I immediately noticed the traditional shape of the church, the use of English (when used) in the services and recitation of traditional English hymns, to a pipe organ accompaniment. Over the next year I developed a rather different appreciation of the space: I came to know individuals, have my own memories bound up with the church and (as I talked to people about the church) I could see a similar line of development in the thoughts and feelings of others. Those that had worshipped there for several years would often talk about the history of the building in colonial days and memories from their own life in a way that wove the two together. Therefore although traces of colonial worship were very visible in the church, with its

stained glass windows designed by Lockwood Kipling (Rudyard's father) and the signs on the pews that noted that a viceroy once knelt and prayed there, the congregants were not disturbed by this; on the contrary, most seemed to take comfort in noting these traces.

10.9 Landscapes of the Living and the Dead

One particularly striking feature of contemporary Christ Church is the way that the landscapes of the dead and the living combine. As previously discussed, Ingold has argued that part of the power of the typical parish church landscape is that the ancestors of the congregation are literally buried in the roots of the church, by being buried in the graveyard (Ingold 2000: 205-207). Christ Church does not have a graveyard outside the church, but what is instantly striking to everyone who goes to Christ Church is that the wall is lined with commemorative plaques. These plaques do not, of course, mark the blood ancestors of most of the congregation. For, in contrast to the church Ingold describes, the people who are built into the fabric of this church (its walls) are the former governing elite. They are the ancestors of the place, but not necessarily the genetic ancestors of the people. Here then we can see tangible traces of the wider landscape rupture, which the city as a whole witnesses as does the wider church building. Yet, far from this being a source of discomfort it is for many a source of comfort, it is as if the church landscape holds within it the key to answering the mystery of the wider contemporary landscape of the city.

During fieldwork in Shimla, between 2006 and 2012, I was frequently informed by members of the congregation of Christ Church that the building was something that they are part of just as it is part of them and yet, they were also always intimately aware that it is something that has a life which stretched back beyond them (Miles-Watson 2012). Strangely, this did not seem to disturb the congregants in anyway; in fact they seemed to find it reassuring. During a full calendar year of fieldwork in Shimla (2009-2010) I noticed a frequent reference to colonial historical events as part of people's identity narratives (Miles-Watson 2012). Most contemporary congregants, although not all, held a sense that people who dwelled in Shimla in the colonial past were connected to them in postcolonial present through shared patterns of worship in shared places (Miles-Watson 2013). Therefore, through both being part of this landscape and being aware of the traces of the past, they had become connected with a time before their own and with the ancestors of the place, who are not their own genetic ancestors. Through such worship the other became incorporated into the group identity and the ruptures of history obviated. The church then was clearly a source of Ingoldian connections through time, but these connections were purely spatial and in no way genetic.

10.10 Bridging Churchscape Capital and Group Identity in Shimla

By sensitively entering into and helping to constitute landscapes of worship that are both relevant to the present and harmonised with the past, the small Christian population of Shimla perform an important kind of civil service. For, they generate a sort of capital that is not just held by them but is offered the community as a whole, or rather they transform themselves into the key that unlocks the

riddle of Shimla's past for all the community. It is therefore not surprising that it is not only Shimla's Christians who view Christ Church as central to their identity but many of the wider community. Like most Christians in Shimla I lived embedded within a middle class Hindu community and yet, perhaps partly due to polytropic tendencies (Carrithers 2000), my neighbours were extremely proud of Christ Church, which they considered as much their church as that of the Christians. As was the case in Northumberland, here in Shimla this was especially the case with the long term residents, who had lived there for over 50 years.

Most of these Hindu residents worshiped daily at home, which may be taken to hint at an opposition between private Hindu space and public Christian space. However, such a division is easily overblown and many of my Hindu informants also regularly went to one of the various Hindu temples that top the surrounding hills. There is however an important distinction here, for these temples are implicitly associated with the Hindu, natural, or received, landscape, which was forged through events in mythic time, whereas Christ Church was associated with the urban, or built environment, which was forged through the events of colonial time. Since Shimla, despite the etymological argument, was primarily a product of action in colonial time, to be a Shimlite was therefore to be connected in some way with that identity. Being a Shimlite of course is an identity that is nested for many inside the broader category of being a Himachali and when asked what religious landscapes are key to Himachali identity the same informants that named Christ Church as central to Shimlite identity would often talk of Hindu shrines and places of more distant pilgrimage. In these cases it is clear that we do not have an oppositional Christian / Hindu identity, so much as an identification with aspects of Christian worship that are comfortably encompassed within a wider Hindu scheme of practice and identity.

Throughout 2009 I heard and recorded a wide range of childhood identity narratives from Hindus that were centred on the experience of worship at Christ Church. I also met Hindus who still go to attend special services at Christ Church today and who were fondly connected to what they perceived as traditional Christian worship (Miles-Watson 2013). Indeed, when in 2006 and 2009 I witnessed Hindu residents who were exposed to less traditional celebrations at Christ Church I noted their sense of confusion during the events. Although I never heard it explicitly vocalised in these terms I recorded in my field journal in December 2009 that there was a general sense that "Christians had a dharma (or Divine duty) to play their part in generating landscapes of worship that help to answer the somewhat disturbing questions generated by Shimla's very visible history". These questions do not lie in the mind of beholder, but rather arise implicitly from the inscriptions on the landscape that result from a rupture with the colonial past (Gable 2010).

Between December 2006 and November 2010 I had the opportunity to talk with a large section of middle and upper class local Hindu residents who felt that Christ Church was central to Shimla and therefore central to the identity of a Shimlite (Miles-Watson 2012). It is my understanding that it was central, partly because of the spot it held, but also because it reinforced and created a

connection with the past through the church landscape, which is suggested by Ingold, but adds the element of the ability to connect through rupture. Thus, we see the landscape, centred on the church, acting in a way that is reminiscent of Lévi-Strauss' discussions of myth in the Amazon (1981, 1994). That is to say that the landscape has the ability to overcome the traumas of history, not by remaining static but by being open to history and incorporating it (Miles-Watson 2012).

This sense of timelessness is also picked up and valued by the other key constituents of the churchscape: tourists. These are, largely, Indian tourists, who tend to be seasonal, coming mainly during the hottest time of the year. The visitor's book of Christ Church Cathedral is filled with inscriptions by Hindu tourists who without exception all remark on how moved they were by the churchscape. In particular, they frequently note that what they value most about the church is the sense of timeless peace that they feel upon entering it.

I interviewed groups of tourists from the Punjab, Hyderabad and Mumbai in 2010 and all of these groups pointed to the historical traces of action in the church (the plaques on the wall, various adornments) combined with its continuing use as a space of worship as central to its sense of timeless peace. Ironically, some in the church see the tourists as destroying this peace through their noisy presence, while others are more seriously worried that the churchscape capital will be devalued by the change in the landscape that tourists bring (Miles-Watson 2013).

There is of course a power dynamic at work in any collectively held resource and the churchscapes of Shimla are no exception to this. Indeed, to fully access the benefits of the churchscape capital that I have outlined a process of enskilment in how to reckon with that environment has to be undertaken (Miles-Watson 2012). Such a process involves a guided engagement with the landscape that is clearly not open to all and while these systems bridge faith divisions they also cement class and educational distinctions. It is possible to say that while the churchscape is rich in both bridging and bonding capital it is rather weak in a sort of downward linking capital.

I have previously discussed (Miles-Watson 2013) at length this dynamic, along with the battle within the Christian community for fresh expressions that both undermine current hierarchical systems and the very connections that I have here been examining. While these divisions are real and at times painfully felt they have not, at present, seriously devalued the churchscape capital that is the subject of this paper. More importantly, despite these divisions the churchscape continues to heal the ruptures of history and generate a valuable kind of landscape capital that inevitably holds together (and draws from) all of these distinct threads.

Although Christians are a minority group in Shimla, who have received little academic attention, they are part of a central churchscape that is rich in landscape capital. In Shimla, the churchscape capital has not been torn apart by the ruptures of social change; rather it has become the anchor for the increasingly distinct flows of humans that knot around it. Here the human and the non-human continue to be drawn together along with past and the present and this creates a sense of stability

against the ravages of history, not by ignoring them but by incorporating them. For, the landscape of Shimla clearly poses problems: problems of memory and identity, as well as issues of how to vocalise a personal story about this landscape when the past actions of others shout so clearly and loudly from it. The churchscape too has within it these problems, but the churchscape also gives answers to these dilemmas and these answers are not hoarded by a minority group but rather presented as a sort of cypher to the wider civil society; through this process the churchscapes of Shimla are able to heal the wider landscape's ruptures.

10.11 Landscape Capital and Historical Rupture

It is clear from the above discussion that the concept of landscape capital has something to offer, beyond its common usage as a term for the intergenerational transfer and transformation of labour to wealth in small scale societies (e.g. Brookfield 1984, 1986, 2001a). The concept also suggests, at a general level, that the British government's recent attempt to assess the capital of "natural" landscapes, in largely functional, economic, terms needs also to heed the complex intricacies of place, person and identity. What is remarkable here is the way that Ingold's notion is complicated by historical rupture without the value of the landscape's capital being undermined. This then suggests the ability of the landscape processes to resist change by incorporating it, hence generating a sense of stability through displaying the trace of historical upheaval.

Religious landscape capital emerges from this discussion somewhat counter intuitively, as a supercharged, or central, form of landscape capital in the modern migrant city. Thus, it may be argued that, for migrant communities, the importance of engaging with the historical trace of sacred action is heightened. Here, more than ever, religion in the post-secular city (Baker and Beaumont 2011) emerges from the private home into the centre of the public sphere. What is more, it is striking, that in postcolonial Shimla, it is precisely that which may be thought to be most socially redundant, the churchscape, which emerges above all other religious landscapes as the richest site of sacred landscape capital.

References

- Arias, S. and Warf, B. 2008. *The Spatial Turn: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. London: Routledge.
- Baker, C. and Beaumont, J. 2011. Postcolonialism and Religion: New Spaces of Belonging and Becoming in the Postsecular City. In *Postsecular Cities: space, theory and practice*, eds. J. Beaumont and C. Baker, 33-39. London: Continuum.
- Baker, C. and Miles-Watson, J. 2010. Faith and Traditional Capitals: Defining the public scope of spiritual and religious capital. *Implicit Religion* 13 (1): 17-69.
- Baker, C. and Skinner, H. 2006. *Faith in Action—the dynamic connection between spiritual and religious capital*. Manchester: William Temple Foundation.

Postprint version of 'Miles-Watson, J. (2015), 'Ruptured Landscapes, Sacred Spaces and the Stretching of Landscape Capital'. Sooväli, H., Reinert, H., Miles-Watson, J. Eds, (2015), Ruptured Landscapes: Landscape and Identity in Times of Social Change, Landscape Series, Vol. 19, Dordrecht: Springer'. Final text available through Springer: <http://www.springer.com/gb/>.

- Baker, C. and Smith, G. 2010. *Spiritual, religious and social capital—exploring their dimensions and their relationship with faith-based motivation and participation in UK civil society*. Manchester: William Temple Foundation.
- Basso, K. H. 1996. *Wisdom sits in places: Landscape and language among the Western Apache*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Bhasin, R. 2009. Quite the Adopted Child: the Legacy of Shimlas Architecture. In *Whispering Deodars: Writings from the Shimla Hills*, ed. M. Chaudhry, 90-98. New Delhi: Rupa.
- Blaikie, P. and Brookfield, H. 1987. *Land Degradation and Society*. New York: Methuen.
- Bourdieu, P. 1986. The forms of capital. In *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*, ed. J. Richardson, 241-258. New York: Greenwood.
- Brookfield, H. 1984. Intensification revisited. *Pacific Viewpoint* 25 (1): 15-44.
- Brookfield, H. 1986. Intensification intensified. *Archaeology in Oceania*, 31 (3): 177-180.
- Brookfield, H. 2001a. *Exploring agrodiversity*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Brookfield, H. 2001b. Intensification, and Alternative Approaches to Agricultural Change. *Asia Pacific Viewpoint* 42 (2-3): 181-192.
- Buck, E. 1925. *Simla Past and Present*. Bombay: The Times Press.
- Cameron, H. 2004. Obstacles to Social Cohesion. In *Religious Capital in Regenerating Communities*, eds. E. Graham and C. Baker, 15-21. Manchester: Manchester Centre for Public Theology.
- Carrithers, M. 2000. On Polytypy, Or the Natural Condition of Spiritual Cosmopolitanism in India: The Digambar Jain Case. *Modern Asian Studies* 34 (4): 831-862.
- Chandramouli, C. 2011. *Census of India 2011: Provisional Population Totals*. New Delhi: Office of Registrar General and Census Commissioner.
- Chung, U. 2000. *Politics of a Dispersed Minority Community: a Study of the Christians of Himachal Pradesh*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, Himachal Pradesh University, Shimla, India.
- Coleman, J. 1988. Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital. *American Journal of Sociology* 94: 95-120.
- Davie, G. 2006. Vicarious religion: a methodological challenge. In *Everyday religion: Observing modern religious lives*, ed. N. Ammerman, 21-37. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Davies, D. 1994. Introduction: Raising the Issues. In *Sacred Place*, eds. J. Holm and J. Bowker, 1-7. London: Pinter Publishers.
- Dynes, R. 2006. Social Capital: Dealing With Community Emergencies. *Homeland Security Affairs* 2 (2): 1-26.
- Eliade, M. 1959. *The sacred and the profane: the nature of religion*. New York: Harcourt.
- Field, J. 2003. *Social Capital*. Routledge: London. Gable, E. 2010. *Anthropology and Egalitarianism: Ethnographic Encounters from Monticello to Guinea-Bissau*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Postprint version of 'Miles-Watson, J. (2015), 'Ruptured Landscapes, Sacred Spaces and the Stretching of Landscape Capital'. Sooväli, H., Reinert, H., Miles-Watson, J. Eds, (2015), Ruptured Landscapes: Landscape and Identity in Times of Social Change, Landscape Series, Vol. 19, Dordrecht: Springer'. Final text available through Springer: <http://www.springer.com/gb/>.

- Greenagel, F. L. 2001. *The New Jersey Churchscape: Encountering eighteenth and nineteenth century churches*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Grey, D. 2004. The Monastery of Saint Francis and Gorton Trust. In *Proceedings of the Launch Conference of the Manchester Centre for Public Theology*, 28-31. Manchester: Centre for Public Theology.
- Ingold, T. 2000. *The Perception of the Environment: Essays in Livelihood, Dwelling and Skill*. London: Routledge.
- Ingold, T. 2007. *Lines: A Brief History*. London: Routledge.
- Ingold, T. 2011. *Being Alive: Essays on Movement, Knowledge and Description*. London: Routledge.
- Knott, K. 2005a. *The Location of Religion: A Spatial Analysis*. London: Equinox.
- Knott, K. 2005b. Spatial Theory and Method for the Study of Religion. *Temenos* 41: 153-84.
- Knott, K. 2008. Spatial theory for the study of religion. *Religion Compass* 26: 1102–1116.
- Knott, K. 2010. Religion, Space, and Place: The Spatial Turn in Research on Religion. *Religion and Society: Advances in Research* 1 (1): 29-43.
- Lane, B. C. 1988. *Landscapes of the Sacred: Geography and narrative in American spirituality*. New York: Paulist Press.
- Lévi-Strauss, C. 1981. *The Naked Man*. London: Cape.
- Lévi-Strauss, C. 1994. *The Raw and the Cooked*. London: Pimlico. Lefebvre, H. 1991. *The Production of Space*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Leppman, E. J., 2005. Appalachian Churchscapes: The Case of Menifee County, Kentucky. *Southeastern Geographer* 45 (1): 83-103.
- Marcus, L. 2007. Spatial Capital and How to Measure it: an outline of an analytical theory of the social performativity of urban form. In *Proceedings of the 6th International Space Syntax Symposium Istanbul*. <http://www.spacesyntaxistanbul.itu.edu.tr/papers.htm>, accessed 26 April 2014.
- Marcus, L. 2010. Spatial Capital. *The Journal of Space Syntax* 1 (1): 30-40.
- Martin, G. and Benassi, M. 1999. The dark side of social capital. In *Corporate social capital and liability*, eds. R. Leenders and S. Gabby, 298-308. Boston: Kluwer.
- Miles-Watson, J. 2008. Incorporating and obviating history: the importance of Lévi-Strauss cold culture theory for contemporary landscape studies. Paper presented at Estonian Institute of Humanities Symposium in Social and Cultural Theory *Taking the Spatial Turn*, Käsmu, July 24-25 2008.
- Miles-Watson, J. 2012. The Cathedral on the Ridge and Other Examples of Implicit Mythology in the Shimla Hills. *Suomen Antropologi* 37 (4): 30-46.
- Miles-Watson, J. 2013. Pipe Organs and Satsang: Contemporary Worship in Shimlas Colonial Churches. *Culture and Religion* 14 (2): 204-222.

Postprint version of 'Miles-Watson, J. (2015), 'Ruptured Landscapes, Sacred Spaces and the Stretching of Landscape Capital'. Sooväli, H., Reinert, H., Miles-Watson, J. Eds, (2015), Ruptured Landscapes: Landscape and Identity in Times of Social Change, Landscape Series, Vol. 19, Dordrecht: Springer'. Final text available through Springer: <http://www.springer.com/gb/>.

- Miles-Watson, J., Reader, J. and Atherton, J. 2008. *Glendale Alive*. Report for the Rural Mission and Ministry Initiative. Manchester: William Temple Foundation.
- Miles-Watson, J. and Miles-Watson, S. 2011. Conflicts and Connections in the Landscape of the Manimahesh Pilgrimage. *Tourism: An International Interdisciplinary Journal* 593: 319-333.
- Morrow, V. 1999. Conceptualising Social Capital in Relation to the Well-Being of Children and Young People: A Critical Review. *The Sociological Review* 47 (4): 744-765.
- Putzel, J. 1997. Accounting for the Dark Side of Social Capital: Reading Robert Putnam on Democracy. *Journal of International Development* 9 (7): 939-949.
- Olwig, K. 1996. Recovering the Substantive Nature of Landscape. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 86: 630-653.
- Pubby, V. 1988. *Shimla Then and Now*. New Delhi: Indus. Putnam R. 2000. *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Sharma, U. 1986. *Womens Work, Class, and the Urban Household: a Study of Shimla, North India*. London: Tavistock.
- Smith, J. Z. 1978. *Map is not territory: Studies in the history of religions*. Leiden: Brill.
- Soja, E. W. 1996. *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real-and-Imagined Places*. Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell.
- Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs. 2011. *The natural choice: securing the value of nature*. London: HM Government.
- Woolcock, M. 1988. Social Capital and Economic Development: Toward Theoretical Synthesis and Policy Framework. *Theory and Society* 27 (2): 151-208.
- Wylie, J. 2007. *Landscape*. London: Routledge.